



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## NOTES ON QUINTILIAN.

BY GEORGE M. LANE.

*Shall we say *divōm* or *divōm* in the genitive plural?*

OF the genitive plural suffix *-om* Professor Stolz says in his grammar, p. 210:—

‘Es ist nach den Ausführungen OSTHOFF’S M. U. 1, 207 f. wahrscheinlich, dass das idg. Suffix zur Bildung dieses Casus *-ōm* gewesen sei. Das Lateinische trägt zur Entscheidung, ob *-ōm* oder *-ōm* die ursprüngliche Form gewesen sei, nichts bei, da alle auf *-m* auslautenden langen Silben der Kürzung unterlagen (Priscian 1, 366 H). . . . Auch die *o*-Stämme bildeten ursprünglich den Gen. d. Plur. mittels des Suffixes *-om*, daher als Münzlegenden *Romanom*, *Corano(m)*, vgl. osk. *Nūvlanīm*, umbr. *puplu(m)*, gr. *θεών*.’

Some indications of the quantity of this *o* in *-o*-stems may be found inside the Latin language itself. They are put together here in the hope that if attention is once directed to this point, other and perhaps better evidences may be found.

(1) That the *o* of this genitive plural was originally long is indicated by coins struck before the first Punic war. Mommsen says of these (CIL. I, p. 9):—

‘In his non casu, sed consulto post longam vocalem omisam esse *m* finalem demonstrat cum huius omissionis summa constantia (nam *m* reperitur post *ō* tantum in *Romanom* n. 1, et in *Aiserninom* n. 20, quod utrumque et singulare est et dubium), tum quod post correptam vocalem, ut in *Volcanom* quarto casu, praeterea in *Aisernim*, *propom*, *prboum*, eadem littera in iisdem nummis semper adest.’

Briefly: in the genitive plural, *m* is regularly dropped after *o*; in singular forms it is always retained after *o*. This consistent variation indicates an essential difference between the two *o*’s, and this difference can hardly be anything but a difference in quantity.

(2) An additional evidence for the long *ō* or *ū* is found in the apex occurring in an inscription of Nuceria, in which all the apices are

used with care: DVVMVIRATVS (IRN. 2096; CIL. X, n. 1081). Attention was called to this inscription as long ago as 1856 by Schmitz, *Rhein. Mus.* X, 110. Little or no stress, however, is to be laid on the *u* longa of DEVM, in another inscription quoted by Schmitz, *Beiträge*, p. 29, from Gruter, p. 29, 2, as an evidence of long  $\bar{u}$ . This particular inscription is now regarded as forged: see CIL. VI, 5, n. 3143\*.

(3) A passage of Quintilian (1, 6, 18) bearing upon this question has been overlooked by grammarians:—

idem ‘centum millia nummum’ et ‘fidem deum’ ostendant duplicis quoque soloecismos esse, quando et casum mutant et numerum.

This innocent conception of the genitive plural ‘nummum’ and ‘deum’ as misused accusatives singular, shows that in Quintilian’s day the *u* of the old form of the genitive plural was always short.

To put the chronological evidence then roughly into figures, we have: (1) Evidence of long  $\bar{o}$  in coins before the first Punic war; also of long  $\bar{u}$  in the Nuceria inscription, certainly as late as 63 B.C. Exactly where this inscription is to be put between the limits of 63 B.C. and 79 A.D. is hard to say: Mommsen seems dimly to refer it to the time of the earthquake of 63 A.D. (p. 124); but possibly the form EQVOM occurring in it may be a faint indication of an earlier date. (2) We have evidence that the long  $\bar{o}$  or long  $\bar{u}$  had disappeared, and was entirely forgotten, about 100 A.D.

Originally, therefore, *divōm*, then, as might have been expected, *divōm*, *divūm*, or *deūm*.

---

#### *A Bad Example.*

Quintilian is made to say (1, 4, 27):—

iam quosdam illa turbabunt, quae declinationibus non tenentur. nam et quaedam participia an uerba an appellationes sint dubitari potest, quia aliud alio loco ualent, ut ‘lectum’ et ‘sapiens,’ et quaedam uerba appellationibus similia, ut ‘fraudator nutritor.’

So Halm and Meister. The general sense is: taking a word by itself, without the context, you cannot always make out what part of

speech it is. Thus, 'sapiens' may be a participium, *smacking, tasting*, or an appellatio, *sage*.

But what about 'lectum,' and how does that illustrate the principle? If it is to be participle or appellative, it must mean *chosen, picked*, or *bed, couch*. Surely this is a very bad example. First, why the accusative of 'lectus,' *bed*, when the other examples are in the nominative, 'sapiens fraudator nutritor'? Cf. 1, 4, 20: ut esset uocabulum corpus uisu tactuque manifestum, 'domus lectus,' appellatio, cui uel alterum deesset uel utrumque, 'uentus caelum deus uirtus.' Secondly, there is a difficulty in the quantity of the *e*, it being *ē* in 'lēctum,' *bed*, and *ē* in 'lēctum,' *picked*; unless Quintilian is thinking merely of *eye* Latin, and regards only the look of the word, and not the sound.

The least touch of the pen will heal the difficulty. For 'lectum' read 'tectum,' as participium, *covered*, as appellatio, *roof, house*.

### *Rehabilitation of Medea's Nurse.*

The passage in Quintilian, 1, 4, 16, which was not understood by Spalding or by Bonnell, and is given up as hopeless by the last two editors, Halm and Meister, may be restored by a very simple change, with a word of explanation. It reads in Halm and Meister thus:—

quid o atque u permutata inuicem? ut 'Hecoba' et '†notrix,' 'Culcides' et 'Pulixena' scriberentur.

The hitch lies in the word '†notrix,' which is adopted, though not without question, by both editors.

Looking to the manuscript authority for '†notrix,' we find it amounts to nothing. The Ambrosian and all the other manuscripts give 'nutrix,' which is quite right, and should not have been displaced from the text. The form '†notrix' is due to a whim of the corrector of the Ambrosianus.

This corrector assumes that there are two pairs of illustrations: (1) one pair of 'o put for u,' as 'Hecoba' and '†notrix,' and (2) one pair of 'u put for o,' as 'Culcides' and 'Pulixena.'

As to 'Hecoba,' as an anterior form for 'Hecuba,' there is of course no trouble. But then the '†nōtrix' for 'nūtrix.' If the cor-

rector had only had the patience to read the next words, he would have seen how impossible '†notrix' was. Quintilian goes on without a break : —

ac ne in graecis id tantum notetur, 'dederont' et 'probaueront.'

Obviously, therefore, Quintilian's remark is only intended for Greek words, and so '†notrix' would be out of place as an illustration, even if there were the best manuscript authority for it.

This leaves us three illustrations of the dictum, 'Hecoba,' 'Culcides,' and 'Pulixena,' instead of two pairs.

Now, what is to become of 'nutrix'? 'Nutrix' and 'Culcides' belong together, and 'Culcides' is conceivably a genitive form, inasmuch as such genitives as 'Salutes Apolones,' etc., are not unheard of. But as they hardly become part and parcel of the literary language, it is safe to make a little change, as has already been suggested by Seyffert, and write 'Culcidis' for 'Culcides.'

Who the 'Culcis' is, it is hardly necessary to explain: 'Colchis,' *the Colchian dame*, is the stereotype designation of Medea, from Euripides (*Med.* 131), down : —

ἔκλυον δὲ βοᾶν τᾷς δυστάνου  
Κολχίδος,

and the 'inpudica Colchis' of Horace (*Epod.* 16, 58), and 'callida Colchis' of Ovid (*Mett.* 7, 301) are so familiar that it is needless to give further illustrations.

The 'nutrix,' too, the faithful *bonne* of the Colchian dame, or as Sheridan would call her, 'the confidante in white linen,' the *τροφός* of Euripides, the 'antiqua erilis fida custos corporis' of Ennius, with her memorable 'utinam ne,' is almost as familiar a character as Medea herself.

But why 'nutrix' at all, when the illustration is confined to 'Culcidis'? Because the combination is more suggestive, more quotable than the genitive alone would be. Thus, in 1, 5, 13, the illustration is confined to the word 'Canopitarum'; but Quintilian gives it 'Canopitarum exercitum.' And so the combination 'nutrix Culcidis,' — *τροφὸς τῆς Κολχίδος*, — possibly the ending of a senarius culled from some early Medea-tragedy, is more suggestive than the bare 'Culcidis' would be.